

PATENT  
09/845,463

Since the basic combination of Microsoft Explorer and Aritomi lack such a teaching, the Examiner reaches for Lamping. Lamping discloses that detailed and extensive hierarchies of items may be made more presentable on a display screen by a dynamic spiral-like array in which the items appear to get larger as such items approach the forefront of the display interface. While Applicants concede that Lamping may disclose the enlargement of icons as they approach the user, it is not seen where in either the Aritomi or Lamping references there is any suggestion that the three references be combined to disclose the present invention. While Aritomi may arguably suggest a complete hierarchical arrangement of items or icons for the purpose of eliminating a sequence of menus of such items, there is no suggestion in any of the references of looking to the esoteric helix of items or icons shown in Lamping.

Applicants also respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 6, 8, 25, 16, 26, 22, 24, and 27 under 35 USC 103(a) over the combination of the Microsoft Explorer Screen Dumps in view of the Aritomi patent (US6,619,632), further in view of Lamping et al (US5,619,632), still further in view of Karkkainen (US6,600,936) is also respectfully traversed.

In addition to the combination of elements described above in the independent claims, these dependent claims set forth that the tracked use characteristics of the user be the basis for sizing and or moving the icons in the array. Karkkainen appears to just teach conventional user input movements to a computer screen by a pointing device, be used directly to organize the display screen in the interface format preferred by the user. The disclosure of Karkkainen is just the standard arranging of the display interface by direct user pointing means to set up the preferred user display. The response of the computer screen to such direct

AUS920010249US1

5

PATENT  
09/845,463

user input is not tracking of use characteristics of an individual, it is merely the direct user pointer input to a display screen.

With respect to claims 25, 26, and 27, we have reached a level of novelty wherein the Examiner has to use five combined references in an attempt to render the invention unpatentable. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of these claims over the combination of the Microsoft Explorer Screen Dumps in view of the Aritomi patent (US6,619,632), further in view of Lamping et al (US5,619,632), still further in view of Karkkainen (US6,600,936) as set forth above, but even further in view of Hochmut (US6,377,286).

Claims 25-27 are submitted to be patentable for the reasons set forth above for their independent claims. In addition, these claims set forth that the use characteristics of the user are tracked and provide the basis varying the locations of the icons in the hierarchy. Even if Hochmuth arguably does disclose moving an icon from one location to another based upon tracked icon selection count, these claims are submitted to still be patentable for all of the reasons set forth above for the independent claims from which claims 25-27 respectively depend.

Accordingly, Applicants must submit that Examiner's proposed combination of three, four and even five references is being made not with the requisite foresight of one skilled in the art, but rather with the hindsight obtained solely by the teaching of the present invention. This approach cannot be used to render Applicants' invention unpatentable.

"To imbue one of ordinary skill in the art with knowledge of the invention in suit, when no prior art references of record convey nor suggest that knowledge, is to fall victim to the insidious

AUS920010249US1

6